



To be Made Public Note:

Rickie-Allen: of the Family Holt
Ordinary Common Man
Paramount Security Interest Holder
%16101 Heyden
Detroit Michigan [48219-9999]

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

In The Matter of:

City of Detroit, Michigan

Chapter 9
13-53846-SWT
Steve Rhodes, JUDGE

FILED
2014 JUL 11 A 11:47
U.S. BANKRUPTCY
E.D. MICHIGAN-DETROIT

**OBJECTION TO RESOLUTION PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE PLAN
FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF DEBTS OF THE CITY OF DETROIT AND THE
OMNIBUS OBJECTIONS CLAIMS BY THE CITY AND IT AGENTS**

Please Take Notice of the Following:

1. On July 18, 2013 the City of Detroit/CITY OF DETROIT filed for bankruptcy, which forced Rickie-Allen: Holt a man, also Paramount Security Interest Holder, and the Aboriginal and Indigenous People located to the place called Detroit Michigan into an unconscionable contract(s) against their will.
2. On dates after July 18, 2013 Rickie-Allen: Holt a man, also Paramount Security Interest Holder, and the Aboriginal and Indigenous People on the land called Detroit, Michigan unanimously and collectively objected to any plan to bankruptcy for the City of Detroit/CITY OF DETROIT.
3. On dates after July 18, 2013 the City of Detroit/CITY OF DETROIT, Kevyn D. Orr so-called emergency manager, agent(s), elected, and unelected officials proceeded to dismantle the Peoples City of Detroit Charter, created by the People to protect the People.
4. On dates after July 18, 2013 the City of Detroit/CITY OF DETROIT, Kevyn D. Orr so-called emergency manager, agent(s), elected, and unelected officials violating Rickie-Allen: Holt a man, also Paramount Security Interest Holt, and the Aboriginal and Indigenous People's Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1786, article(s) 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, Which violates The Constitution to the United States of America, article VI.
5. On July 1, 2014 Kevyn D. Orr so-called emergency manager and other agent(s) are proceeding to dismantle the City's Charter, General Retirement System, wages and benefits for Police, Fire, Water and other Unionized employees. Kevyn D. Orr created Order No. 28 which gave a 5% wage increase to the City's Non-union employees, including Mayoral appointees and elected officials effective July 1, 2014. While the City is currently in receivership. Rickie-Allen: Holt a man, and Paramount Security Holder feels and believes that these wage increases are bribes to keep the current elected officials silent to the corruption being perpetrated on the People to the City of Detroit/CITY OF DETROIT

6 Rickie-Allen: Holt a man, Paramount Security Interest Holder, and the Freehold for the Aboriginal and Indigenous People on the land the land called Detroit Michigan are objecting to the City of Detroit/CITY OF DETROIT, and Kevyn D. Orr's omnibus objection and or any objection to Our Birthrights Claims, PRF#6475 Case No. 13-53846 Svc: 2 Pack ID 456 Name ID 11532436 / PRF#65446 Case No. 13-53846 Svc: 4 Pack ID 2968 Name ID 11906801 / PRF#65475 Case 13-53846 Svc: 2 Pack ID 997 Name ID 11747163 for cause: the City's bankruptcy could not be claimed if not for HJR 192 June 5, 1933 73rd Congress 1st Session, Public law No. 10 Approved, June 5, 1933, 4:40pm 31 USCA. 462,463. The Paramount Security Interest Holder Rickie-Allen: Holt a man has actual monies US Silver Coins (27) pieces minted before 1922. Furthermore: **The Passage of HJR 192 JOINT RESOLUTION TO SUSPEND THE GOLD STANDARD AND ABROGATE THE GOLD CLAUSE JUNE 5, 1933 H.J.192 73rd Cong. 1st Session.**

Joint resolution to assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States.

Whereas the holding of or dealing in gold affect the public interest, and therefore subject to proper regulation and restriction; and

Whereas the existing emergency has disclosed that provisions of obligations which purport to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency of the United States, or in an amount of money of the United States measured thereby, obstruct the power of the Congress to regulate the value of money of the United States, and are inconsistent with the declared policy of the Congress to maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar, coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in payment of debts.

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

That (a) every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency, or in an amount of money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy; and no such provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred. Every obligation, heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provisions is contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any such coin or currency which at the time is legal tender for public and private debts. Any such provision contained in any law authorizing obligations to be issued by or under authority of the United States, is hereby repealed, but the repeal of any such provision shall not invalidate any other provision or authority contained in such law.

(b) As used in the resolution, the term "obligation" means an obligation (including every obligation of and to the United States, excepting currency) payable in money of the United States; and the term "coin or currency" means coin or currency of the United States, including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations.

SEC. 2. The last sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 43 of the Act entitled "An Act to relieve the existing national economic emergency by increasing agricultural purchasing power, to raise revenue for extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of such emergency, to provide emergency relief with respect to agricultural indebtedness, to provide for the orderly liquidation of joint-stock land banks, and for other purposes", approved May 12, 1933, is amended to read as follows:

"All coins and currencies of the United States (including Federal reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations) hereunto and hereafter coined or issued, shall be legal tender for all debts, for public and private, public charges, taxes, duties, and dues, except gold coins, when below the standard weight and limit of tolerance provided by law for the single piece, shall be legal tender only at valuation in proportion to their actual weight." Approved June 5, 1933, 4:30 p.m., the Emergency Banking Act March 9, 1933, 48 stat. 1, Public law 89-719 these commercial acts could not exist if the men/women Peoples Birthrights were not collateralized.

7. On dates after July 1, 2013 the City of Detroit/CITY OF DETROIT, its agent(s) elected, unelected, and Kevyn D. Orr has fail to properly serve certain Creditors/Men/Women. Namely Rickie-Allen:

Holt Paramount Security Interest Holder, and the Aboriginal Indigenous People on the land called Detroit Michigan. The "City" its agent(s) et,al fail to follow the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; Rule 4 Summons (a) F, Rule 4 amendment (b), Rule 4 Service (2),(3), Rule 4 Foreign State (i).

8. Rickie-Allen: Holt a man "I dispute this debt and all claims to contract in accordance with Title 15 U.S.C. 1692 (g) forced upon the men, women, and the People by way of coercion, duress, and threat.

9. Rickie-Allen: Holt a man, the Aboriginal Indigenous People to the land called Detroit Michigan is forced into contract(s) by, and though the UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION, GOVERNOR RICHARD SNYDER, CITY OF DETROIT, AGENTS OF THE CITY OF DETROIT and SO-CALLED EMERGENCY MANAGER TO THE CITY OF DETROIT Kevyn D. Orr.

10. The UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION, GOVERNOR RICHARD SNYDER, CITY OF DETROIT, AGENTS OF THE CITY OF DETROIT and SO-CALLED EMERGENCY MANAGER TO THE CITY OF DETROIT Kevyn D. Orr, are violating the Rights of the Peoples for reasonable redress of Grievances.

11. The UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION, GOVERNOR RICHARD SNYDER, CITY OF DETROIT, AGENTS OF THE CITY OF DETROIT and SO-CALLED EMERGENCY MANAGER TO THE CITY OF DETROIT Kevyn D. Orr, are violating Universal Postal Union; The UPU (Universal Postal Union) in Berne, Switzerland, is an extremely significant organization in today's world. It is formulated by treaty. No nation can be recognized as a nation without being in international admiralty in order to have a forum common to all nations for engaging in commerce and resolving disputes. That is why the USA under the Articles of Confederation could not be recognized as a country. Every state (colony) was sovereign, with its own common law, which foreclosed other countries from interacting with the USA as a nation in international commerce. Today, international admiralty is the private jurisdiction of the IMF, *et al.*, the creditor in the bankruptcy of essentially every government on Earth. The UPU operates under the authority of treaties with every country in the world. It is, as it were, the overlord or overseer over the common interaction of all countries in international commerce. Every nation has a postal system, and also has reciprocal banking and commercial relationships, whereby all are within and under the UPU. The UPU is the number one military (international admiralty is also military) contract mover on the planet. For this reason one should send all important legal and commercial documents through the post office rather than private carriers, which are firewalls. We want direct access to the authority—and corresponding availability of remedy and recourse—of the UPU. For instance, if you post through the US Post Office and the US Postmaster does not provide you with the remedy you request within twenty-one (21) days, you can take the matter to the UPU. 2. The post office establishment of the United States, is of the greatest importance to the people and to the government. The constitution of the United States has invested congress with power to establish post offices and post roads. Art. 1, s. 8, n. 7. The UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION, GOVERNOR RICHARD SNYDER, CITY OF DETROIT, AGENTS OF THE CITY OF DETROIT and SO-CALLED EMERGENCY MANAGER TO THE CITY OF DETROIT Kevyn D. Orr, have been utilizing The UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE and not the United States Post Office.

12. The UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION, GOVERNOR RICHARD SNYDER, CITY OF DETROIT, AGENTS OF THE CITY OF DETROIT and SO-CALLED EMERGENCY MANAGER TO THE CITY OF DETROIT Kevyn D. Orr, has been violating Title 18 U.S. Code § 1341 Frauds and Swindles, Title 18 U.S. Codes § 241 Conspiracy Against Rights, Title 18 U.S. Code § 242 Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law. The above named entities' (UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION, GOVERNOR RICHARD SNYDER, CITY OF DETROIT, AGENTS OF THE CITY OF DETROIT and SO-CALLED EMERGENCY MANAGER TO THE CITY OF DETROIT Kevyn D. Orr) has

and is committing commercial warfare against Rickie-Allen: of the family Holt and the men, women, and the Aboriginal Indigenous People on the land called Detroit, Michigan.

Respectfully Submitted for the People,

Rickie-Allen: of the Family Holt

Rickie-Allen: of the family Holt, Paramount Security Interest Holder
All Rights Reserved...

Barbra Patricia: Matriarch of Family Holt

Witness, Barbra-Patricia: Matriarch of the Family Holt
All Rights Reserved...

July 17th Two Thousand Fourteen

July 17th Two Thousand Fourteen
Great Family Seal

Great Family Seal

Cc; United States Attorney General
State of Michigan Attorney General
Chief JUDGE BANKRUPTCY SOUTHERN DIVISION

Robin v. Hardaway 1790. Biblical Law at "Common Law" supersedes all laws, and "Christianity is custom, custom is Law."

United States of America Congressional Record

Monday, August 19.1940

Excerpt – pages 4-5

"I want you to note particularly that this was in 1913, and that 1913 was the very year we changed our Government from a republic to a semidemocracy; the year in which we destroyed constitutional government, international security, and paved the road for us to become a colony of the British Empire. It was also the same year in which we, by adopting the Federal Reserve Act, placed our Treasury under the control and domination of the Bank of England and the international banking groups that are now financing the British-Israel movement in the United States."

Two Different and Distinct Nations

"The idea prevails with some, indeed it has expression in arguments at the bar, that we have in this country substantially two national governments; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument, by exercising such powers as other nations of the earth are accustomed to... I take leave to say that, if the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system will result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism... It will be an evil day for American Liberty if the theory of a government outside the Supreme Law of the Land finds lodgment in our Constitutional Jurisprudence. No higher duty rests upon this court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violation of the principles of the Constitution."

--Honorable Supreme Court Justice John Harlan in the 1901 case of *Downes v. Bidwell*.

"Neither consent nor submission by the states can enlarge the powers of Congress; none can exist except those which are granted. United States v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1, 56 S.Ct. 312, 102 A.L.R. 914, decided January 6, 1936. The sovereignty of the state essential to its proper functioning under the Federal Constitution cannot be surrendered; it cannot be taken away by any form of legislation. See United States v. Constantine, 296 U.S. 287, 56 S. Ct. 223." Ashton v. Cameron County Water Imp. Dist. No. 1, 298 U.S. 513, 531 (1936)

“Men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, -life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and to 'secure,' not grant or create, these rights, governments are instituted. That property [or income] which a man has honestly acquired he retains full control of. . .”
[Budd v. People of State of New York, 143 U.S. 517 (1892)]

Von Hoffman v. City of Quincy, 71 U.S. 4 Wall. 535 535 (1866)Page 71 U. S. 551 "Nothing can be more material to the obligation than the means of enforcement. Without the remedy, the contract may, indeed, in the sense of the law, be said not to exist, and its obligation to fall within the class of those moral and social duties which depend for their fulfillment wholly upon the will of the individual. The ideas of validity and remedy are inseparable, and both are parts of the obligation, which is guaranteed by the Constitution against invasion. The obligation of a contract 'is the law which binds the parties to perform their agreement.'

“Because of what appears to be a lawful command on the surface, many Citizens, because of their respect for what appears to be law, are cunningly coerced into waiving their rights due to ignorance.” US v Minker, 350 US 179 at 187(1956)

Gibbons v Ogden 1824 supreme court “Persons are not the subjects of commerce... ”

Simon v. Craft, 182, U.S. 427, 436, 21 SUP. CT. 836, 45 L. ED 1165;

“In determining whether such rights were denied, we are governed by the substance of things and not by mere form; ID.; Louisville & N.R. CO. v. Schmidt, 177 U.S. 230, 20 SUP. CT. 620 44 L. ED 747.

— *Supreme Court of the United States 1795 “Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them.” S.C.R. 1795, Penhallow v. Doane's Administraters (3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54),*

“Where there are no depositions, admissions, or affidavits the court has no facts to rely on for a summary determination.” Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647.

McNally v. U.S., 483 U.S. 350, 371-372, *Quoting U.S. v Holzer*, 816 F.2d. 304, 307
Fraud in its elementary common law sense of deceit... includes the deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation. A public official is a fiduciary toward the public,... and if he deliberately conceals material information from them he is guilty of fraud.

424 F.2d 1021 UNITED STATES v. Horton R. PRUDDEN, No. 28140. . United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit. April 1970 Silence can only be equated with fraud where there is a legal or moral duty to speak or where an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading.

U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F. 2d. 297, 299, 300 (1977)

Silence can only be equated with fraud when there is a legal and moral duty to speak or when an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading. We cannot condone this shocking conduct... If that is the case we hope our message is clear. This sort of deception will not be tolerated and if this is routine it should be corrected immediately.

Morrison v. Coddington, 662 P. 2d. 155, 135 Ariz. 480(1983).

Fraud and deceit may arise from silence where there is a duty to speak the truth, as well as from speaking an untruth.

[Federal jurisdiction] "...must be considered in the light of our dual system of government and may not be extended. . .in view of our complex society, would effectually obliterate the distinction between what is national and what is local and create a completely centralized government." *United States v. Lopez*, 514 U.S. 549, 115 S.Ct.1624(1995).

"In view of 40 USCS 255, no jurisdiction exists in United States to enforce federal criminal laws, unless and until consent to accept jurisdiction over lands acquired by United States has been filed in behalf of United States as provided in said section, and fact that state has authorized government to take jurisdiction is immaterial." *Adams v. United States* (1943) 319 US 312, 87 L Ed. 1421, 63 S. Ct. 1122

In regard to courts of inferior jurisdiction, "if the record does not show upon its face the facts necessary to give jurisdiction, they will be presumed not to have existed." *Norman v. Zieber*, 3 Or at 202-03

US v Will, 449 US 200,216, 101 S Ct, 471, 66 LEd2nd 392, 406 (1980) *Cohens V Virginia*, 19 US (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5LEd 257 (1821)

"When a judge acts where he or she does not have jurisdiction to act, the judge is engaged in an act or acts of treason."

Zeller v. Rankin, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326 *When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid statutes expressly depriving him of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost.*

JURISDICTION: NOTE: It is a fact of law that the person asserting jurisdiction must, when challenged, prove that jurisdiction exists; mere good faith assertions of power and authority (jurisdiction) have been abolished.

"The state citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure, absent contract." see, Dred Scott vs. Sanford, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 or as the Supreme Court has stated

clearly, "... every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen without his consent."

CRUDEN vs. NEALE, 2 N.C. 338 2 S.E. 70

FRAUD BY GOVERNMENT

McNally v. U.S., 483 U.S. 350, 371-372 (1987), Quoting U.S. v. Holzer, 816 F.2d. 304, 307:

"Fraud in its elementary common law sense of deceit - and this is one of the meanings that fraud bears in the statute, see United States v. Dial, 757 F.2d 163, 168 (7th Cir. 1985) - includes the deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation. A public official is a fiduciary toward the public, including, in the case of a judge, the litigants who appear before him, and if he deliberately conceals material information from them he is guilty of fraud.

Clearfield Doctrine

"Governments descend to the Level of a mere private corporation, and take on the characteristics of a mere private citizen...where private corporate commercial paper [Federal Reserve Notes] and

securities [checks] is concerned. ... For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as entities entirely separate from government." -

Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States 318 U.S. 363-371 (1942)

"When governments enter the world of commerce, they are subject to the same burdens as any private firm or corporation" -- U.S. v. Burr, 309 U.S. 242

See: 22 U.S.C.A.286e, Bank of U.S. vs. Planters Bank of Georgia, 6L, Ed. (9 Wheat) 244; 22 U.S.C.A. 286 et seq., C.R.S. 11-60-103

Mattox v. U.S., 156 US 237,243. (1895) "We are bound to interpret the Constitution in the light of the law as it existed at the time it was adopted."

S. Carolina v. U.S., 199 U.S. 437, 448 (1905). "The Constitution is a written instrument. As such, its meaning does not alter. That which it meant when it was adopted, it means now."

Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137,(1803) "The Constitution of these United States is the supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is null and void of law."

Murdock v. Penn., 319 US 105, (1943) "No state shall convert a liberty into a privilege, license it, and attach a fee to it."

Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 373 US 262, (1969) "If the state converts a liberty into a privilege, the citizen can engage in the right with impunity."

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, (1966) "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation, which would abrogate them."

*"The **rights** of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government." City of Dallas v Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944*

Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425, (1886) "An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."

Miller v. U.S., 230 F.2d. 486,489 "The claim and exercise of a Constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime."

"To take away all remedy for the enforcement of a right is to take away the right itself. But that is not within the power of the State." Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270, 303 (1885).

Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742, 748,(1970) "Waivers of Constitutional Rights, not only must they be voluntary, they must be knowingly intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness."

Carnley v. Cochran, 369 U.S. 506, 516 (1962), "Presuming waiver from a silent record is impermissible. The record must show, or there must be an allegation and evidence which show, that an accused was offered counsel but intelligently and understandingly rejected the offer. Anything less is not waiver."

Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S.Ct. 1401 (1958). "No state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it." The constitutional theory is that we the people are the sovereigns, the state and federal officials only our agents."

"[I]n common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, [and] statutes employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it." United States v. Cooper Corp., 312 U.S. 600, 604 [1941;] accord, United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 1947.]

Colten v. Kentucky (1972)407 U.S. 104@122. 92 S.Ct. 1953; Dissent by Douglas "If the nation comes down from its position of sovereignty and enters the domain of commerce, it submits itself to the same laws that govern individuals therein. It assumes the position of an ordinary citizen and it cannot recede from the fulfillment of its obligations;" 74 Fed. Rep. 145, following 91 U.S. 398.

"Knowing failure to disclose material information necessary to prevent statement from being misleading, or making representation despite knowledge that it has no reasonable basis in fact, are actionable as fraud under law."

Rubinstein v. Collins, 20 F.3d 160, 1990

[a] "Party in interest may become liable for fraud by mere silent acquiescence and partaking of benefits of fraud."

Bransom v. Standard Hardware, Inc., 874 S.W.2d 919, 1994

*Ex dolo malo non oritur actio. Out of fraud no action arises; fraud never gives a right of action.
No court will lend its aid to a man who founds his cause of action upon an immoral or illegal
act.*

As found in Black's Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, page 509.

*"Fraud destroys the validity of everything into which it enters,"
Nudd v. Burrows, 91 U.S. 426.*

*"Fraud vitiates everything"
Boyce v. Grundy, 3 Pet. 210*

*"Fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents and even judgments."
U.S. v. Throckmorton, 98 US 61*

When a Citizen challenges the acts of a federal or state official as being illegal, that official cannot just simply avoid liability based upon the fact that he is a public official. In United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 220, 221, 1 S.Ct. 240, 261, the United States claimed title to Arlington, Lee's estate, via a tax sale some years earlier, held to be void by the Court. In so voiding the title of the United States, the Court declared:

"No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy, and to observe the limitations which it imposes upon the exercise of the authority which it gives.

"Shall it be said... that the courts cannot give remedy when the citizen has been deprived of his property by force, his estate seized and converted to the use of the government without any lawful authority, without any process of law, and without any compensation, because the president has ordered it and his officers are in possession? If such be the law of this country, it sanctions a tyranny which has no existence in the monarchies of Europe, nor in any other government which has a just claim to well-regulated liberty and the protection of personal rights."

See Pierce v. United States ("The Floyd Acceptances"), 7 Wall. (74 U.S.) 666, 677 ("We have no officers in this government from the President down to the most subordinate agent, who does not

hold office under the law, with prescribed duties and limited authority"); Cunningham v. Macon, 109 U.S. 446, 452, 456, 3 S.Ct. 292, 297 ("In these cases he is not sued as, or because he is, the officer of the government, but as an individual, and the court is not ousted of jurisdiction because he asserts authority as such officer. To make out his defense he must show that his authority was sufficient in law to protect him... It is no answer for the defendant to say I am an officer of the government and acted under its authority unless he shows the sufficiency of that authority"); and Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270, 287, 5 S.Ct. 903, 912

WHEREAS, officials and even judges have no immunity (See, Owen vs. City of Independence, 100 S.Ct. 1398; Maine vs. Thiboutot, 100 S.Ct. 2502; and Hafer vs. Melo, 502 U.S. 21; officials and judges are deemed to know the law and sworn to uphold the law; officials and judges cannot claim to act in good faith in willful deprivation of law, they certainly cannot plead ignorance of the law, even the Citizen cannot plead ignorance of the law, the courts have ruled there is no such thing as ignorance of the law, it is ludicrous for learned officials and judges to plead ignorance of the law therefore there is no immunity, judicial or otherwise, in matters of rights secured by the Constitution for the United States of America. See: Title 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983.

"When lawsuits are brought against federal officials, they must be brought against them in their "individual" capacity not their official capacity. When federal officials perpetrate constitutional torts, they do so ultra vires (beyond the powers) and lose the shield of immunity." Williamson v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 815 F.2d. 369, ACLU Foundation v. Barr, 952 F.2d. 457, 293 U.S. App. DC 101, (CA DC 1991).

"Personal involvement in deprivation of constitutional rights is prerequisite to award of damages, but defendant may be personally involved in constitutional deprivation by direct participation, failure to remedy wrongs after learning about it, creation of a policy or custom under which unconstitutional practices occur or gross negligence in managing subordinates who cause violation." (Gallegos v. Haggerty, N.D. of New York, 689 F. Supp. 93 (1988).

*"The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings."
Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 533*

*"If you've relied on prior decisions of the Supreme Court you have a perfect defense for willfulness."
U.S. v. Bishop, 412 U.S. 346*

State citizenship

U.S. v. Anthony 24 Fed. 829 (1873) "The term resident and citizen of the United States is distinguished from a Citizen of one of the several states, in that the former is a special class of citizen created by Congress."

Barbara Patricia Halt